DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 263 110 SP 026 925

AUTHOR Clements, Barbara S.
TITLE Beginning Teachers' Use of Classroom Management Training. R&D Rep. 6019.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jul 85
CONTRACT NIE-G-83-0006-P1
NOTE 47p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; *Classroom Techniques; Inservice Teacher Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Teacher Behavior; Teaching Experience; *Training Methods

ABSTRACT

This study compares classroom management behaviors of two groups: beginning teachers and teachers with one year of teaching experience. It also examines differences in the ability of beginning teachers and second-year teachers to incorporate classroom management training in the establishment and maintenance of learning environments. The analysis focuses on a subsample of 29 teachers (11 beginning and 18 second-year) participating in the Junior High Management Improvement Study. Participants studied a manual, attended two workshops at the beginning of the year, and were observed periodically to assess training effects and student and teacher behaviors. Teachers were interviewed at the end of the year, and completed questionnaires regarding their use of the training materials. Results indicated that though there were treatment effects for second-year teachers, most beginning teachers were not able to implement most of the management recommendations. Second-year teachers used good classroom management strategies more consistently and were more successful in maintaining student engagement. Beginning teachers' inability to use the recommended behaviors appeared to be related to their lack of experience and understanding of classroom processes, rather than lack of attention to training materials. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED263110

Beginning Teachers' Use of Classroom Management Training

Barbara S. Clements

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 026 925

(R&D Rep. 6019)

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

July 1985

This study was supported by the National Institute of Education, Contract NIE-G-83-0006, P1, Research on Classroom Learning and Teaching Project. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the NIE and no official endorsement by that office should be inferred. Requests for reprints should be addressed to: Communication Services, R&DCTE, EDA 3.203, The University of Texas at Austin.

Beginning Teachers' Use of Classroom Management Training

Barbara S. Clements

Abstract

This study compares classroom management behaviors of beginning teachers and teachers with one year of teaching experience. In addition, it examines differences in the ability of beginning teachers and second-year teachers to incorporate classroom management training in the establishment and maintenance of learning environments. The analysis focuses on a subsample of 29 teachers (11 beginning and 18 second year) participating in the Junior High Management Improvement Study. Experimental group teachers received a manual, Organizing and Managing the Junior High Classroom, and two workshops at the beginning of the school year. Two classes of all teachers, both experimental and control, were observed periodically throughout the study to assess training effects and student and teacher behaviors. In addition, teachers were interviewed at the end of the school year, and treatment group teachers completed questionnaires regarding their use of the training materials.

Compared with results obtained for the full sample in the JMIS, relatively few treatment effects were obtained for the experimental group as a whole in this study. Interaction results indicated that although there were treatment effects for second-year teachers, most first-year teachers were not able to implement most of the management recommendations. Across treatment and control groups there was a large number of significant differences for years of experience. Second-year teachers used good classroom management strategies more consistently,

Beginning Teachers' Use of Classroom Management Training

The first year of teaching is currently receiving increased attention because of its apparent importance in the professional preparation of teachers. During the first year, new teachers begin to confirm, revise, or reject expectations about appropriate teaching behaviors established before or during teacher training. Because of their isolation in the classroom and the lack of special induction programs aimed at providing new teachers with suggestions and support to ease entry into classroom teaching, most new teachers develop a utilitarian perspective about teaching. "The need to act, the pressure to respond, launches the beginning teacher on a period of trial and error learning" (Nemser, 1983, p. 159). This leaves room for individual expression but narrows the range of alternatives to be tried and may result in the beginning teacher misinterpreting the results of particular behaviors. Beliefs, attitudes, and expectations formulated under these conditions may or may not represent those needed to become effective teachers (Ryan, 1980).

Teachers who have "survived" the first year of teaching have a better perspective on what is required of a teacher and what are typical student behaviors. As a result, they are able to organize and pace instruction better (Pajak & Blase, 1982). During the second and third years of teaching, teachers begin to consolidate what was learned in preservice training and what was learned "on-the-job."

This study was designed to explore differences in the classroom management behaviors of beginning teachers and teachers with one year of teaching experience. In addition, this study attempts to explore differences in the ability of beginning teachers and second-year

teachers to successfully incorporate classroom management training in the establishment and maintenance of good learning environments.

Research on Classroom Management

Recent research on teaching effectiveness suggests there is a relationship between student involvement in learning activities and student achievement (cf. review by Good, 1982, and Medley, 1977). In addition, research has underscored the importance of classroom organization and management strategies to maintaining student task-oriented behavior (Emmer & Evertson, 1981). Kounin (1970) in a study of 49 first- and second-grade classrooms found moderate to high correlations between various teacher management behaviors and student work involvement and freedom from deviancy. Arlin (1979) found that when teachers structured and monitored transitions between instructional activities, there was less off-task behavior. In a study of 28 third-grade teachers, Emmer, Evertson, and Anderson (1980) found that effective classroom managers spent considerable time during the first 3 weeks of school helping students learn how to behave in the classroom. Better managers were more aware of what was happening and were quick to eliminate inappropriate behavior. In instructional activities, better managers gave clearer directions and presentations and more carefully monitored student understanding.

At the junior high level, Evertson and Emmer(1982) found similar classroom management behaviors to be associated with student on-task behavior and lack of inappropriate behavior. Better managers from the group of 51 teachers in the study were found to set clear expectations for behavior, academic work standards and classroom expectations at the beginning of the school year, and they maintained student involvement

through careful monitoring, consistent use of consequences and well organized lessons. These findings are consistent with the results of a comparison of new and "best" teachers made by Moskowitz and Hayman (1976) who found that best teachers focused more on setting expectations and establishing appropriate behavior on the first day of school.

The Moskowitz and Hayman (1976) study suggests that research needs to be done on how beginning teachers learn what they need to know to be effective classroom managers.

Research on Beginning Teachers

Most of the research on beginning teachers has focused on problems faced by beginning teachers, changes in attitudes which occur during the first year of teaching, and ways in which the beginning teacher becomes socialized in the workplace. Many of these studies are based on first-hand accounts of the teaching experience. Much of this research highlights the problems beginning teachers have with classroom management.

Numerous studies have been done on the perceived problems or deficiencies of beginning teachers (see Veenman, 1984 for a review of recent research). Veenman (1984) found that the most frequently mentioned problem of beginning teachers in 83 recent studies was classroom discipline. Four of the top eight problems listed may be considered related to organizing and managing the classroom: (1) classroom discipline; (3) dealing with individual differences; (6.5) organization of class work; and (8) dealing with problems of individual students. Other researchers have confirmed the prevalence of these problems (Adams, 1982; Atkinson & Taylor, 1982; Broadbent & Cruickshank, 1965; Johnson & Ryan, 1980; Lacey, 1977).

A number of studies have looked at changes in attitudes and resultant behaviors during the first year of teaching. Hoy (1969) found that beginning teachers become significantly less humanistic and more custodial over the first year. Lagana (1970) found that beginning teachers' attitudes toward students become less favorable over the first 4 months of teaching and that male teachers have less favorable attitudes than female teachers. Ryan (1970) found that during the first year, beginning teachers learned they could not just be themselves, they had to assume the teacher role and they had to control their emotions. In addition, they learned a lot about what students are like and how to work with them.

Studies such as the ones done by Lacey (1977) and Lortie (1975) highlight the insufficiency of preservice training and the impact of the school and the classroom on the beginning teacher. Grant and Zeichner (1981) cite research which indicates that effective teaching is largely situation-specific and that preservice programs cannot provide beginning teachers with all the skills they will need to function well in all situations. As Becker (1964) noted, people tend to take on the characteristics required by the settings in which they participate. Beginning teachers frequently resort to using strategies used by their former teachers, their cooperating teacher, or other teachers in the school because these people know how it is supposed to be in the classroom.

Given the apparent lack of help in classroom management provided in preservice education and the obvious need of beginning teachers for training in how to create and maintain an effective learning environment, what is the best way to provide assistance to beginning

teachers? Lortie (1975) suggests that preservice courses are too theoretical and they should provide more training in practical skills. Nemser (1983) questions whether teacher educators can or should impart practical know-how. Nemser suggests that although preservice students want recipes for classroom behaviors, a better strategy would be to provide different ways of thinking and alternate solutions from which to choose. According to Reighart (1984), "Teaching problems often require more than categorical resolutions involving information, techniques or facts. Problems also require reflection about what should be done and the potential consequences of alternative courses of action. To analyze and evaluate teaching problems and to justify choices, the teacher needs a consciously formulated framework of beliefs about teaching" (p. 2).

Doyle (1977) wrote that "The process of becoming a teacher, as distinct from simply learning to teach, involves learning an institutionalized role and the enactment of that role in an environment which itself acts upon the teacher" (p. 2). In student teaching, the preservice student has an opportunity to experience the role of teacher, but this is of limited value because the student teacher typically has little control over what is taught and how it is taught. Typically the experience involves a very limited range of activities and interactions (Nemser, 1983). Becoming a teacher requires building functional representations of classroom actions and this may best be done "on-the-job." A teacher must learn to recognize relevant cues, use feedback and determine what is a condition for a particular action (Yinger, 1983). The extent to which instruction on effective teaching behaviors can be assimilated by a beginning teacher may depend on how

well a teacher understands classroom events, which may be impacted by the amount of experience in the classroom a teacher has.

Summary

The research on classroom management and beginning teachers has suggested two things:

1. Good classroom management is important to the establishment of good learning environments.

2. Beginning teachers have problems with classroom management.

This study was conducted to verify whether training in the use of classroom management strategies identified in previous research would result in the establishment and maintenance of good learning environments in junior high classrooms. In order to test the effectiveness of classroom management training on relatively inexperienced teachers, an experimental study was conducted.

Methods and Data Source

The teachers who participated in this study are a subsample of junior high and middle school teachers who participated in the Junior High Management Improvement (JMIS) Study (see Emmer, Sanford, Clements, & Martin, 1982), a study designed to determine whether teachers who received research-based classroom management training would implement the suggested behaviors and whether such implementation would lead to high levels of student cooperation. Results of the JMIS, which included 38 teachers in the main treatment and control groups, indicated that the treatment teachers used significantly more of the recommended management practices and established classes with more appropriate, task-oriented student behavior than did the control teachers at the beginning of the school year.

The sample for the present study consisted of 29 teachers from the JMIS sample: 11 beginning teachers and 18 second-year teachers who taught sixth-, seventh-, or eighth-grade mathematics, English, science, or social studies in nine junior high or middle schools. The schools are located in two urban school districts in two southwestern cities.

Recruitment of teachers for the JMIS took place during the 2 weeks prior to the beginning of the school year. Teachers were contacted by telephone and all relevant details of the study were explained by a staff member. All teachers were volunteers and were paid a small stipend for participating in the study.

All teachers in the final JMIS sample were divided into experimental and control groups using a system of stratified random sampling, balancing for subject taught and years of experience. Five of the beginning teachers and 10 of the second-year teachers were part of the experimental group of teachers. The major component of the JMIS treatment was teachers' use of a manual, Organizing and Managing the Junior High Classroom (Emmer, Evertson, Sanford, Clements, & Worsham, 1981), which was based on earlier descriptive-correlational research results and included guidelines and rationale for effective management practices, suggested behaviors, case studies, and checklists. The manual covered such areas as planning rules, procedures and consequences; presenting behavior guidelines to students at the beginning of the school year; maintaining appropriate student behavior throughout the school year; and organizing instructional activities.

During inservice days prior to the beginning of school, experimental group teachers attended a half-day workshop in their respective cities, where they received a copy of the manual. Workshop

activities focused on explaining the study more fully, describing the research base for the manual, and discussing the areas of the manual dealing with the beginning of school.

After 4 weeks of school, experimental group teachers attended a second half-day "booster" workshop. Activities at this workshop focused on classroom management maintenance strategies and instructional organization. Teachers were given an opportunity to discuss management problems and develop solutions with other teachers and research project staff members. At the end of this workshop, teachers were asked to complete a questionnaire indicating how useful they had found the various manual chapters and how much they had read and studied each chapter. Experimental group teachers also completed this questionnaire in March at the end of the study. The teachers in the control group received the management manual and a workshop in March after observations were completed.

Two classes of all teachers, both experimental and control, were observed periodically throughout the study to assess the effects of training on experimental teachers' management behaviors. One class of each teacher was observed on the first day of the school year, and approximately 10 additional times in the first 8 weeks of school. Another class for each teacher was observed approximately seven times in the first 8 weeks of school. In January and February, four additional observations were made of each class remaining in the study for a total of eight observations per teacher in this period. Two beginning teachers and two second-year teachers were not observed in January and February because they obtained new classes at the end of the first

semester. Observations lasted for the entire class period, which averaged 55 minutes in length.

Classroom observations were conducted by 20 trained observers, most of whom had classroom teaching or research experience. Training activities included reliability checks, practice with videotapes of classroom instruction, and other types of practice exercises.

A number of different types of data were collected. During each observation, observers wrote a description of classroom activities and behavior on the narrative record form. Preserved in this record were the sequence of activities, the amount of time spent in each activity, and the behaviors of the teacher and students. Beginning at a randomly determined time during the first 10 minutes of class and thereafter every 10 minutes, observers stopped taking notes for the narrative record and completed a Student Engagement Rating. On the SER form, the observer recorded the number of students engaged in academic or procedural activities or those who were either off task or in dead time. SER counts were later converted to proportions and averaged across each observation. After each observation, observers completed a set of Likert-type ratings called Component Ratings in which they assessed student task orientation, inappropriate and disruptive student behavior, and a variety of teacher management behaviors. At the end of the first 8 weeks of school and again after the mid-year observations, observers completed a set of summary Likert-type ratings of teacher behaviors using a scale of 1-5 (Observer Ratings of Teachers). Additional information was obtained from (a) teacher interviews conducted at the end of the school year; and (b) questionnaires, concerning use of the

treatment suggestions, completed after the second workshop and at the end of the study.

Results

Teacher behavior measures were obtained during classroom observations. Data were collected using three different measures: Component Ratings (CRs), Addendum Component Ratings (ADCRs) completed during the first week of school only, and Observer Ratings of Teachers (ORTs). These instruments were used to address the question of whether the management training materials and workshops were effective for the beginning and second-year teachers and the question of whether there were differences in teacher behaviors that might be attributed to amount of experience in the classroom. Because of sample attrition, only data from the beginning of the school year are included in the analysis. Selected variables from each instrument were grouped into one of the nine management areas (cf. Table 1). These variables provided evidence of teachers' use of the management behaviors recommended in the manual during the first 2 months of the school year.

These variables were analyzed using an analysis of variance with two between-group variables: experimental/control group membership and years of experience (zero or one). Results for experimental/control group differences and experience differences are reported in Table 1; interactions are reported in Table 2. (Because of the small sample size, these significance tests are very low in power; hence, a significance value of $p \leq .10$ will be used.) The results, presented by management area, are briefly summarized below.

1. Room arrangement. One of the two indicator variables in this area was significant ($p < .05$) for years of experience, but neither was significant for group membership.

2. Rules and procedures. Of eight variables in this area, seven were significant for group membership and one other approached significance. Experimental group teachers had more efficient classroom routines and fewer problems with students in areas such as speaking without permission and being out of seat. Six of the eight variables were significant and one other approached significance for years of experience. Second-year teachers had more appropriate general procedures and fewer problems with students speaking without permission and being out of seat.

3. Procedures for student accountability. All four of the variables in this area were significant indicating greater use of the recommended behaviors by experimental group teachers. Three of the variables were significant for years of experience. Second-year teachers were more consistent in holding students accountable for their work and had more suitable routines for assigning, checking, and collecting work. The significant interaction seems to indicate that second-year experimental group teachers were more successful at holding students accountable for their work than the other teachers and the beginning treatment group teachers were least successful.

4. Consequences. The one indicator variable for this area had a significant interaction. An inspection of the means seems to indicate that second-year experimental group teachers rewarded appropriate student behavior the most. Both beginning control teachers and

second-year control teachers rewarded more appropriate behavior than did beginning experimental group teachers.

5. Activities for the first week. Only one of the six indicator variables in this area showed a trend toward an experimental group effect, Teacher provides feedback or review or rules and procedures. Two of the six variables indicated an effect for years of experience, and three variables were nearly significant. Second-year teachers presented their rules, procedures and penalties more clearly and stayed in charge of all students more of the time. One significant interaction effect seemed to indicate that second-year experimental group teachers were much better at providing feedback or review of rules and procedures than second-year control teachers, beginning control teachers or beginning experimental group teachers.

6. Maintaining skills. Data analyses in this area showed that experimental group teachers were better at monitoring student behavior and they stopped inappropriate behavior more quickly. In this area, four of the seven variables were significant and three approached significance. Second-year teachers were much better at monitoring and stopping inappropriate behavior before it got out of hand, and they were more consistent in managing student behavior. Of the seven tests of differences for years of experience, five were significant and one approached significance. A near significant interaction seemed to indicate that second-year experimental group teachers were much better at handling disruptions than were the other teachers. Ratings for beginning experimental group teachers were lower than those for second-year control teachers and beginning control teachers.

7. Instructional clarity. Only two of the six variables in this area showed a significant effect for group membership. Experimental group teachers monitored student understanding better and were more likely to wait until all students were attending before giving instructions. All of the six variables indicated significant effects for years of experience. Second-year teachers described objectives more clearly, gave clearer directions, explanations, and presentations, and were better at monitoring student understanding. Four of the variables had significant interactions: describes objectives clearly, clear explanations and presentations, monitors student understanding, and teacher questions to determine student understanding. All of these indicated a much higher rating for second-year experimental group teachers, and three of these (all but monitors student understanding) indicated the lowest rating for beginning experimental group teachers.

8. Organizing instruction. Experimental group teachers were better at planning enough work for students and had more efficient transitions between activities. The other five variables in this area did not show a treatment effect. Second-year teachers were better at having materials ready, pacing lessons and having efficient transitions between activities. Six of the seven variables in this area showed a significant effect for years of experience, and the other variable approached significance.

9. Adjusting instruction for special groups. No treatment impact was identified in this area. One of the two variables indicated a significant difference for years of experience. Second-year teachers provided for more student success in classroom activities.

Student Engagement Ratings (SERs) and four variables from the Component Ratings (CRs) instrument (amount of inappropriate behavior, amount of disruptive behavior, student task orientation and avoidance behavior during seatwork) were used as measures of management effectiveness. These variables were also analyzed using an analysis of variance with group membership and years of experience as between group variables. Results are shown in Tables 3 and 4. There were two significant effects for treatment group membership. Treatment teachers had a higher percentage of students on-task and fewer students in dead time. All but one of the variables showed a significant difference for years of experience. Second-year teachers had more students on-task and less inappropriate and disruptive student behavior. Three of the interactions shown in Table 4 were significant. Second-year experimental group teachers had the least amount of inappropriate behavior, while beginning experimental group teachers had the most inappropriate behavior. Results for avoidance behavior during seatwork are similar: Second-year experimental group teachers had the least amount of avoidance behavior, and beginning experimental group teachers had the most.

Discussion

The comparisons of the experimental and control groups on measures of treatment implementation at the beginning of the school year indicated that the treatment recommendations for developing a workable set of rules and procedures, student accountability, maintaining one's management system, and, to some extent, instructional clarity were used more by experimental group teachers. Teachers' responses to a questionnaire asking the extent to which they had read and studied each

chapter and the extent to which they had used the suggestions in each chapter indicated that Chapter 2, Developing a Workable Set of Rules and Procedures, had received the most attention by the experimental group teachers, and they reported using more of the recommended behaviors from that chapter. While Chapter 6, Maintaining Your Management System, was reported as not being thoroughly read nor the suggestions highly used, it is possible that by setting up an adequate system of rules and procedures at the beginning of school it was easier for teachers to maintain their system. The comparisons of the student behavior in experimental and control group classes indicated only two significant differences in on-task behavior and amount of dead time, although the other indicators suggested trends in the desired direction.

Compared with the results obtained for the full sample in the JMIS (see Emmer et al., 1982), relatively few treatment effects were obtained for the experimental group as a whole in this study. Interaction results indicated that first-year teachers were not able to implement most of the management recommendations, and across treatment and control groups there were a large number of significant differences for years of experience. In all but two areas, consequences and adjusting instruction for special groups, there was at least one indicator showing a significant difference for years of experience, indicating greater use of good classroom management behaviors by second-year teachers. All but one of the indicators of student behavior showed a significant effect for teachers' years of experience. Second-year teachers were better able to maintain high task orientation and to avoid inappropriate and disruptive student behavior than were beginning teachers. This is consistent with research cited previously.

The presence of nine significant interactions on teacher behavior indicators and three significant interactions on student behavior indicators suggests that beginning experimental group teachers were not able to use the suggested behaviors as well as second-year teachers. On each of these indicators, second-year experimental group teachers had much higher ratings than the other teachers, while beginning experimental group teachers had ratings similar to or worse than the beginning and second-year control teachers. At least one of the indicators in six out of the nine treatment areas showed a significant interaction. The area of instructional clarity seemed to pose the most problems for the beginning experimental group teachers. The significant interactions for amount of inappropriate behavior and student avoidance behavior during seatwork suggest second-year experimental group teachers had the least problems while beginning experimental group teachers had the most. It is possible that beginning experimental group teachers were more concerned about being observed and reacted by allowing more inappropriate student behavior in order to avoid interrupting the flow of the lesson.

Comparisons of experimental group teachers' self-reports of study and use of the manual indicated there were no significant differences based on years of experience. Beginning teachers' inability to use the recommended behaviors appears to be related to their lack of experience and understanding of classroom processes, rather than lack of attention to the training materials.

Teacher interview data seemed to confirm these findings. One beginning teacher indicated he wished he had had more time "to sit there and digest everything" (Teacher 11, p. 3). Although he thought things

were going fairly well in his classes by late March, he admitted he had had some problems. He felt he had not been as consistent as he would have liked and he was less successful at stopping inappropriate behavior than desirable. "Before I was a bit hesitant in what to do and what not to do" (Teacher 11, p. 3). Several times in his interview he mentioned that he had not stopped misbehavior more quickly because he lacked confidence. He added that he was not sure what he should do, and he was not sure what he wanted students to do.

Second-year teachers offered a number of comments regarding why they found the treatment suggestions very helpful and how they compared this year to last year. One teacher mentioned that this year she was a lot stricter than she had been in her first year. "I had a real hard time dealing with that at first, because on your first year of teaching you get more involved with your teaching, and I was Ms. Popularity last year. This year my students tend to think of me as more of an authority figure which is what I wanted to project" (Teacher 06, p. 4). As a result of being stricter, this teacher reported feeling more in control of her classes and she felt they were running a lot more smoothly. Teacher 33 also felt that her classes were running more smoothly. She indicated that changes she had made in her rules were "not so much in what the rules actually are and what they were before, but in how I enforce them and how I feel about enforcing them" (p. 3). She further indicated that having the rules selected before school started helped her begin the year with more self-confidence and she "was able to communicate to the students that I was fully in control" (p. 4).

Teacher 36 discussed a number of ways in which she had changed since her first year of teaching, some of which she attributed to participation in the study.

> Last year I wasn't convinced that I was a good teacher. I wasn't convinced that what I was teaching was valuable, and I would waffle on the rules... I just feel like this year I have decided that the kids need to know what I have to teach them. They need to follow a particular structure in order to do that... I think last year my teaching was a series of activities. I did a lot of the same things, but I had not done the thinking behind it of why this could be a good way to teach this particular content or event or whatever. (pp. 5-6)

Teacher 36 obviously was able to reflect on her experiences the previous year and make changes she deemed desirable. In this her second year of teaching she had obviously made a number of changes which were consistent with the suggestions in the treatment and her classes were very well managed and the students were well behaved and task oriented.

Because of the small number of teachers in this study, it would be difficult to say that differences were definitely due to years of experience and not that the beginning experimental group teachers were generally less capable or the training inadequate. The results seem to indicate, however, that further research is needed to determine if beginning teachers can benefit from classroom management training in either preservice or inservice activities, without having had substantial classroom experience. Training might better be broken down into smaller units occurring weekly or monthly such that beginning teachers are not left to use (or not use) the training based on how much

time they can spare to study a manual. Perhaps individualized feedback to the beginning teachers would help them evaluate their classroom management and make changes where needed.

Many of the second-year teachers in this study mentioned that they wished they had received the manual and workshops prior to their first year of teaching. Although their impressions were that having the classroom management suggestions would have made their first year of teaching more successful, the results of this study indicate that having the training may not be enough; it may be necessary to have the on-the-job experience of a year in the classroom in order to make best use of the guidelines offered in the classroom management training.

References

Adams, R. D. (1982, March). Teacher development: A look at changes in teacher perceptions across time. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Arlin, M. (1979). Teacher transitions can disrupt time flow in classrooms. American Educational Research Journal, 16, 42-56.

Atkinson, E. P., & Taylor, S. (1982). Strategies for investigating principals' and graduates' perceptions of a preservice teacher education course. Paper presented at the 12th annual conference of the South Pacific Association for Teacher Education, Melbourne, Australia.

Becker, H. S. (1964). Personal change in adult life. Sociometry, 27, 40-53.

Broadbent, F. W., & Cruickshank, D. R. (1965, October). The identification and analysis of problems of first-year teachers. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 013 786)

Doyle, W. (1977). Learning the classroom environment: An ecological analysis of induction into teaching. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Emmer, E. T., & Evertson, C. M. (1981). Synthesis of research in classroom management. Educational Leadership, 38, 342-347.

Emmer, E. T., Evertson, C. M., & Anderson, L. M. (1980). Effective classroom management at the beginning of the school year. Elementary School Journal, 80, 219-231.

Emmer, E. T., Evertson, C. M., Sanford, J. P., Clements, B. S., & Worsham, M. (1981). Organizing and Managing the Junior High Classroom (R&D Rep. 6151). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin.

Emmer, E. T., Sanford, J. P., Clements, B. S., & Martin, J. (1982). Improving classroom management and organization in junior high schools: An experimental investigation (R&D Rep. 6153). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin.

Evertson, C. M., & Emmer, E. T. (1982). Effective management at the beginning of the year in junior high classes. Journal of Educational Psychology, 74, 485-498.

Good, T. (1982). Classroom research: What we know and what we need to know (R&D Rep. 9018). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin.

Grant, C. A., & Zeichner, K. M. (1981). Inservice support for first-year teachers: The state of the scene. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 14(Winter), 99-111.

Hoy, W. K. (1969). Pupil control ideology and organizational socialization: A further examination of the influence of experience on the beginning teacher. School Review, 67, 257-265.

Johnson, J. M., & Ryan, K. (1980). Research on the beginning teacher: Implications for teacher education. Columbus: Ohio State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 209 188).

Kounin, J. (1970). Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Lacey, C. (1977). The socialization of teachers. London: Methuen.

Lagana, J. F. (1970). What happens to the attitudes of beginning teachers?. Danville, IL: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Medley, D. (1977). Teacher competence and teacher effectiveness: A review of process-product research. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Moskowitz, G., & Hayman, J. L. (1976). Success strategies of inner-city teachers: A year-long study. Journal of Educational Research, 69, 283-289.

Nemser, S. F. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy (pp. 150-170). New York: Longman.

Pajak, E. F., & Blase, J. J. (1982). Teaching, the loss of innocence, and the psychological development of a professional self. Educational Horizons, 60, 65-72.

Reighart, P. A. (1984). Preservice teacher beliefs about teaching. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Ryan, K. (1970). The first year of teaching. In K. Ryan (Ed.), Don't smile until Christmas (pp. 164-190). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research, 54, 143-178.

Yinger, R. J. (1983). Learning the language of practice. In G. A. Griffin & H. Hukill (Eds.), First years of teaching: What are the pertinent issues? (R&D Rep. 9051). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin.

Table 1

Comparison of Teachers' Implementation of Management Behaviors

Variables	Treatment-Control Test			Years of Experience Test		
	Treatment (n=14)	Control (n=15)	p	Beg. Tchr. (n=11)	Sec.-Yr. Tchr. (n=18)	p
Chapter 1: Organizing Your Room and Materials for the Beginning of School						
Suitable traffic patterns (CR2a)	4.19	4.11	.64	4.16	4.14	.92
Efficient use of classroom space (ORT16)	3.86	3.80	.86	3.53	4.01	.04
Chapter 2: Developing a Workable Set of Rules and Procedures						
Efficient administrative routines (CR3a)	4.16	3.73	.02	3.74	4.06	.08
Appropriate general procedures (CR3b)	3.83	3.41	.12	3.24	3.84	.03
Efficient opening and closing routines (CR3e)	3.72	3.09	< .01	3.11	3.57	.07
Frequency of wandering that is not task related (ORT3)	1.61	2.35	.06	2.36	1.76	.14
Frequency of come ups while teacher is engaged with other students (ORT7)	1.83	2.39	.06	2.44	1.93	.09

Table 1 (continued)

Variables	Treatment-Control Test: Treatment (n=14)	Treatment-Control Test: Control (n=15)	Treatment-Control Test: p	Years of Experience Test: Beg. Tchr. (n=11)	Years of Experience Test: Sec.-Yr. Tchr. (n=18)	Years of Experience Test: p
Frequency with which students approach teacher when they need help (ORT11)	2.16	3.12	< .01	2.88	2.51	.27
Frequency with which students raise hands when they need help from teacher (ORT12)	3.94	3.33	< .01	3.36	3.78	.06
Frequency with which students call out when they need help (ORT13)	2.09	2.95	.01	2.96	2.28	.05
Chapter 3: Student Accountability						
Consistently enforces work standards (CR1k)	3.69	3.23	.10	2.97	3.75	< .01
Suitable routines for assigning, checking, and collecting work (CR3d)	3.89	3.56	.07	3.44	3.88	.02
Teacher was successful in holding students accountable for work (ORT24)	4.13	3.60	.07	3.38	4.15	.01
Effective routines for communicating assignments (ORT25)	4.27	3.67	.06	3.64	4.16	.11

Table 1 (continued)

Variables	Treatment-Control Test: Treatment (n=14)	Treatment-Control Test: Control (n=15)	Treatment-Control Test: p	Years of Experience Test: Beg. Tchr. (n=11)	Years of Experience Test: Sec.-Yr. Tchr. (n=18)	Years of Experience Test: p
Chapter 4: Consequences						
Rewards appropriate behavior (CR5b)	2.36	2.15	.43	2.18	2.29	.71
Chapter 5: Planning Activities for the First Week						
Teacher presents, reviews or discusses rules and procedures (ADCR1)	2.99	2.64	.24	2.51	2.99	.11
Presentation of rules, procedures, and penalties is clear (ADCR2)	3.80	3.69	.82	3.28	4.02	.05
Rationale for rules and procedures is explained (ADCR3)	2.76	2.86	.75	2.40	3.05	.13
Presentation of rules and procedures includes rehearsal or practice (ADCR4)	1.85	1.44	.16	1.37	1.80	.14
Teacher provides feedback or review of rules and procedures (ADCR5)	2.86	2.38	.12	2.49	2.68	.60
Teacher stays in charge of all students (ADCR6)	4.52	4.50	.96	4.12	4.74	< .01

Table 1 (continued)

Variables	Treatment-Control Test: Treatment (n=14)	Treatment-Control Test: Control (n=15)	Treatment-Control Test: p	Years of Experience Test: Beg. Tchr. (n=11)	Years of Experience Test: Sec.-Yr. Tchr. (n=18)	Years of Experience Test: p
Chapter 6: Maintaining Your Management System						
Consistency in managing behavior (CR5d)	3.63	3.19	.15	2.85	3.74	< .01
Effective monitoring (CR5e)	3.80	3.16	.01	3.10	3.70	.02
Stops inappropriate behavior quickly (CR7c)	3.79	3.18	.05	3.07	3.72	.04
Cites rules or procedures to stop inappropriate behavior (CR7d)	2.64	2.12	.06	2.54	2.27	.30
Ignores inappropriate behavior (CR7i)	2.32	2.89	.07	2.94	2.42	.12
Teacher lets class get out of hand with half or more pupils off task (ORT2)	1.77	2.46	.13	2.73	1.76	.04
Teacher handles disruptions well (ORT15)	4.11	3.51	.15	3.30	4.10	.06

Table 1 (continued)

Variables	Treatment-Control Test: Treatment (n=14)	Treatment-Control Test: Control (n=15)	Treatment-Control Test: p	Years of Experience Test: Beg. Tchr. (n=11)	Years of Experience Test: Sec.-Yr. Tchr. (n=18)	Years of Experience Test: p
Chapter 7: Instructional Clarity						
Describes objectives clearly (CR1a)	3.29	3.13	.57	2.85	3.42	.02
Clear directions (CR1d)	3.87	3.73	.50	3.45	4.01	< .01
Waits for attention (CR1e)	3.78	3.32	.10	3.02	3.86	< .01
Clear explanations and presentations (CR1i)	3.79	3.61	.40	3.32	3.93	< .01
Monitors student understanding (CR1j)	3.75	3.28	.02	3.28	3.64	.09
When giving instructions teacher questions to determine student understanding (ORT23)	3.65	3.26	.28	2.89	3.79	.02
Chapter 8: Organizing Instruction						
Materials are ready (CR1c)	4.49	4.42	.65	4.24	4.59	.01
Appropriate pacing of lessons (CR1h)	3.61	3.46	.41	3.18	3.74	< .01

Table 1 (continued)

Variables	Treatment-Control Test: Treatment (n=14)	Treatment-Control Test: Control (n=15)	Treatment-Control Test: p	Years of Experience Test: Beg. Tchr. (n=11)	Years of Experience Test: Sec.-Yr. Tchr. (n=18)	Years of Experience Test: p
Attention spans considered in lesson (CR4c)	3.57	3.36	.34	3.08	3.70	< .01
What is the efficiency of transitions (ORT6)	4.00	3.44	.13	3.30	3.96	.08
Teacher consistently plans enough work for students (ORT18)	4.41	3.71	.02	3.76	4.22	.12
Teacher allows activities to continue too long (ORT20)	2.37	2.52	.62	2.88	2.19	.01
Typical assignments are too short or easy (ORT21)	1.73	2.02	.19	2.14	1.72	.06
Chapter 9: Adjusting Instruction for Special Groups						
Student success (CR4a)	3.98	3.86	.57	3.73	4.04	.10
Different assignments and activities for different students (CR1g)	1.21	1.27	.46	1.19	1.27	.33

Table 2

Interaction Effects for Teacher Behavior Variables

Variables	Treatment Group		Control Group		Interaction p
	Beg. Tchr. (n=5)	Sec. Yr. Tchr. (n=9)	Beg. Tchr. (n=6)	Sec. Yr. Tchr. (n=9)	
Chapter 1: Organizing Your Room and Materials for the Beginning of School					
Suitable traffic patterns (CR2a)	4.10	4.24	4.20	4.05	.42
Efficient use of classroom space (ORT16)	3.40	4.11	3.64	3.91	.32
Chapter 2: Developing a Workable Set of Rules and Procedures					
Efficient administrative routines (CR3a)	3.90	4.31	3.60	3.81	.57
Appropriate general procedures (CR3b)	3.29	4.13	3.20	3.55	.34
Efficient opening and closing routines (CR3e)	3.38	3.91	2.88	3.22	.69
Frequency of wandering that is not task related (ORT3)	2.03	1.37	2.64	2.16	.81
Frequency of comeups while teacher is engaged with other students (ORT7)	2.10	1.68	2.72	2.17	.80

Table 2, continued

Variables	Treatment Group: Beg. Tchr. (n=5)	Treatment Group: Sec. Yr. Tchr. (n=9)	Control Group: Beg. Tchr. (n=6)	Control Group: Sec. Yr. Tchr. (n=9)	Interaction p
Frequency with which students approach teacher when they need help (ORT11)	2.20	2.13	3.45	2.90	.41
Frequency with which students raise hands when they need help from teacher (ORT12)	3.67	4.09	3.11	3.47	.87
Frequency with which students call out when they need help (ORT13)	2.93	1.63	2.97	2.93	.06
Chapter 3: Student Accountability					
Consistently enforces work standards (CR1k)	3.02	4.06	2.92	3.43	.31
Suitable routines for assigning, checking, and collecting work (CR3d)	3.45	4.13	3.43	3.64	.18
Teacher was successful in holding students accountable for work (ORT24)	3.33	4.58	3.42	3.72	.10
Effective routines for communicating assignments (ORT25)	3.73	4.57	3.55	3.75	.29

Table 2, continued

Variables	Treatment Group: Beg. Tchr. (n=5)	Treatment Group: Sec. Yr. Tchr. (n=9)	Control Group: Beg. Tchr. (n=6)	Control Group: Sec. Yr. Tchr. (n=9)	Interaction p
Chapter 4: Consequences					
Rewards appropriate behavior (CR5b)	1.89	2.62	2.42	1.96	.04
Chapter 5: Planning Activities for the First Week					
Teacher presents, reviews or discusses rules and procedures (ADCR1)	2.52	3.26	2.51	2.73	.36
Presentation of rules, procedures, and penalties is clear (ADCR2)	3.28	4.08	3.28	3.96	.87
Rationale for rules and procedures is explained (ADCR3)	2.28	3.02	2.50	3.09	.87
Presentation of rules and procedures includes rehearsal or practice (ADCR4)	1.42	2.09	1.33	1.52	.38
Teacher provides feedback or review of rules and procedures (ADCR5)	2.37	3.13	2.60	2.23	.08
Teacher stays in charge of all students (ADCR6)	4.08	4.76	4.15	4.73	.77

Table 2, continued

Variables	Treatment Group: Beg. Tchr. (n=5)	Treatment Group: Sec. Yr. Tchr. (n=9)	Control Group: Beg. Tchr. (n=6)	Control Group: Sec. Yr. Tchr. (n=9)	Interaction p
Chapter 6: Maintaining Your Management System					
Consistency in managing behavior (CR5d)	2.84	4.07	2.86	3.41	.24
Effective monitoring (CR5e)	3.23	4.11	2.98	3.28	.23
Stops inappropriate behavior quickly (CR7c)	3.14	4.15	3.00	3.30	.24
Cites rules or procedures to stop inappropriate behavior (CR7d)	2.80	2.55	2.32	1.99	.89
Ignores inappropriate behavior (CR7i)	2.87	2.02	2.99	2.82	.26
Teacher lets class get out of hand with half or more pupils off task (ORT2)	2.73	1.24	2.72	2.28	.23
Teacher handles disruptions well (ORT15)	3.13	4.65	3.45	3.56	.08
Chapter 7: Instructional Clarity					
Describes objectives clearly (CR1a)	2.56	3.69	3.09	3.16	.03
Clear directions (CR1d)	3.39	4.14	3.51	3.88	.30

Table 2, continued

Variables	Treatment Group: Beg. Tchr. (n=5)	Treatment Group: Sec. Yr. Tchr. (n=9)	Control Group: Beg. Tchr. (n=6)	Control Group: Sec. Yr. Tchr. (n=9)	Interaction P
Waits for attention (CR1e)	3.02	4.21	3.03	3.52	.19
Clear explanations and presentations (CR1i)	3.17	4.13	3.44	3.73	.08
Monitors student understanding (CR1j)	3.30	4.00	3.26	3.29	.10
When giving instructions, teacher questions to determine student understanding (ORT23)	2.63	4.22	3.11	3.35	.06
Chapter 8: Organizing Instruction					
Materials are ready (CR1c)	4.19	4.66	4.29	4.51	.34
Appropriate pacing of lessons (CR1h)	3.18	3.85	3.19	3.64	.49
Attention spans considered in lesson (CR4c)	3.11	3.83	3.05	3.57	.60
What is the efficiency of transitions (ORT6)	3.50	4.28	3.14	3.64	.70
Teacher consistently plans enough work for students (ORT18)	4.13	4.56	3.44	3.89	.97

Table 2, continued

Variables	Treatment Group: Beg. Tchr. (n=5)	Treatment Group: Sec. Yr. Tchr. (n=9)	Control Group: Beg. Tchr. (n=6)	Control Group: Sec. Yr. Tchr. (n=9)	Interaction p
Teacher allows activities to continue too long (ORT20)	2.90	2.07	2.86	2.30	.61
Typical assignments are too short or easy (ORT21)	2.07	1.54	2.19	1.90	.58
Chapter 9: Adjusting Instruction for Special Groups					
Student success (CR4a)	3.63	4.17	3.80	3.90	.24
Different assignments and activities for different students (CR1g)	1.09	1.28	1.28	1.27	.26

Table 3

Comparison of Student Behavior Variables

Variables	Treatment-Control Test			Years of Experience Test		
	Treatment (n=14)	Control (n=15)	p	Beg. Tchr. (n=11)	Sec.-Yr. Tchr. (n=18)	p
Component Rating Variables (5-point scale)						
Disruptive behavior	1.39	1.56	.44	1.81	1.28	.01
Inappropriate behavior	2.22	2.64	.18	2.95	2.12	.009
Task orientation	3.69	3.40	.21	3.16	3.77	.01
Avoidance behavior during seatwork	2.16	2.32	.56	2.67	1.99	.009
Student Engagement Variables						
Proportion of students off-task, unsanctioned	.05	.07	.18	.09	.04	.01
Proportion of students on-task	.91	.85	.01	.83	.90	.002
Proportion of students in dead time	.02	.04	.10	.04	.02	.14

Table 4

Interaction Effects for Student Behavior Variables

Variables	Treatment Group		Control Group		Interaction p
	Beg. Tchr. (n=5)	Sec. Yr. Tchr. (n=9)	Beg. Tchr. (n=6)	Sec. Yr. Tchr. (n=9)	
Component Rating Variables (5-point scale)					
Disruptive behavior	1.83	1.15	1.80	1.40	.49
Inappropriate behavior	3.08	1.74	2.85	2.50	.10
Task orientation	3.10	4.02	3.21	3.52	.17
Avoidance behavior during seatwork	2.88	1.76	2.49	2.22	.09
Student Engagement Variables					
Proportion of students off-task, unsanctioned	0.09	0.02	0.09	0.06	.31
Proportion of students on-task	0.87	0.93	0.80	0.88	.77
Proportion of students in dead time	0.04	0.01	0.04	0.04	.10